

Brown - notes Book

- vi
vii
45
47
48
49
50
50-1
52
74
125
132
134
138
152
Ch. 12-14
140

 - Andrews did not get W.C. Roberts and
Brecht Wall (also Brecht & Brett)
 - Ref. Jack Martin. Longtime with 162. Brown should have taken
his own Martin
 - Story of labor group/committee - but not C.R.C.
 - Martens was at House
 - 614 in volume admitted
 - Martens stated 1911 as change with Fannie
 - Describes Brinquier as an attorney
 - Andrews starting not mentioned. Only in "disposal"
 - Sup no labor activities N.O. 1962
 - Fannie in LAP "through the beginning of 1963"
 - Martens recalls Fannie "not around" 6-10. weekend. Not sure
of John, Phil? (see 51)
 - Ref to Martin call to Fannie Kling. Adv. He did not call
 - Reunited ahead to FBI with ^{intention} Fannie 11/15/63. Arch?
 - Martens gave a written statement
 - Don't indicate Kling's "later" goal of not vis
 - No ref to Martens. Russo relationship ship ^{see} 138
 - Russo said didn't know Legate Martens
 - Phelan's Russo interview "interviewed by a reporter for a
Boston-Anglo newspaper" maybe. But he took Martens there
 - Russo on hypnotic sessions: is a man under hypnosis
conscious of what he is saying?
 - Of Russo told Martens "he would like to meet them frequently"
why did not Martens, Shinn's friend, arrange it? (156)
 - B knows his confession of grand jury evidence & what would
& W.C. just one of its right is avoided
 - With all that is in the mind of B. B. & his type? Then
who the advocate - prominent one

- 155 "Friends" recommended Bremer to Montross - B's 1/10?
a mutual friends? Business or semi? official?
- 156-7 Montross by DA - the right person? Question: (PCL?)
- 159 First of DA interest in Montross - Horne - Montross - because
B knew Garrison would not change "hanging" over Horne, not
in his jurisdiction (see 160)
- 174 Editing photos - B's red type, identified in advance as under the
176 "The transcript of the tape" Don't say which edited or un-
edited. There is no doubt the tape was edited & what was left
out is in substance in truth only. Not as Bremer says. He
doesn't even say it was edited before was in NBC?
- 179, 180 But how did he get it, was on NBC payroll - in papers
181 But how did he get to be double agent? Who hired, paid?
The writing reveals B's awareness of the strangeness of this thing.
- 186 ~~Don't say the two men left the state because of the~~
~~with that~~
- 189-90 I made his own efforts to "kill" another story. I was not asked,
which is before the use date of 6/19 he gives
- 192 I was given he must be under investigation off from a show
that saying of Raymond - should be picked up in town
This mission is culpable
- 197 This is not the true story. Not is of being paid for by Stora.
He got the phone & left it in photo, leaving his baggage on it
out that. This is not the story on the tape of the phone call
- 202 Don't say he had threatened Puck, Regis "in writing and" "B's 1/10"
Bill followed my grasping appearance
- 203 Puck had 3 reporters, who told me
- 207 Many such bullets made
- 215 - Two nice discussions that were only CIA/intelligence purposes
- 211 A - the whole B's to long as chance, have transcripts of 1/19

- on WFLI, Long Island, W 02, N.Y.? Unsubstantiated?
a Public Office? Also ABC had a TV (2/18) (38219)
- 223 of no bullet, still a lie. Pictures do show
no "man" - Chapman through me
- 228-9 one of many instances of internal controls. Letter to J.G.
- 234 Rather selective reference to Department's charges
- 236 Avoids "not capable of killing" - but he did it - John H. Harris -
+ is worried trying to get all this about Sheridan, how
about his getting caught-fugging court?
- 244 Chandler - ref to his last name, means of his program
- 247-8 Announcement not by Garrison, + with drawn under his
order. But is it not interesting that after this brief of
his account a reference to the D.C. sent, B. drops it - but not
Mott? If he did not sign other documents, he
could tell the whole story + with Garrison name. 2-5-5
- 252 "Through a note in Garrison's office" is an odd
way of saying "Through a client of my office"
Spinal... now, would quite indirectly the statement "But
he did the thing - + should have removed it."
- 258 "Shows (Garrison) tried genuinely" to defend W.R. But
being without lawyer's comment. Stupid, smart?
- The O wants to note that our honest ~~stated~~
review of the trial, esp with this title + these
contents, had to acknowledge what the papers did
not. That the trial missed the W.R. + the L.C.
- 260 Anticlimactically, he does not quote at all on leaving
in charge of writing ATM report on doing it
But not T.C. like blue L.H.?
- 262
- Chapter 18 Handled trial as anti-climax - and so select only
The book does ~~it~~ with reference to the charge against
Bethell - the only mention of him by name, even the

get his grant's just about Feb or March 1963

There is earlier reference to what he had done -
but none to the Bremer firm's representation
of him - and he is even left out of
the index.